FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE SIDE.
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 1063 OF 2002

IN
REVIEW PETITION ST. NO. 35810 OF 2001.

IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 558 OF 1990

Office Notes, Office Memorada orders or directions and Registrar's orders.	Court's or Judge's Orders.
	Shri G.H.Hegade for the petitioner. Shri R.R.Salvi for the respondent

CORAM; V.G.PALSHIKAR &
A.M.KHANWILKAR, JJ.

DTAED: 21ST MARCH,2006.

P.C.

1. For reasons mentioned in the Civil Application, delay in filing the Review Petition is condoned.

2. Heard the learned counsel on merit of the Review Petition. The contention is that the interpretation put by us on Rule 7 of the Disciplinary and Appeal Rules is incorrect. That takes away the discretion of the

Corporation to impose major penalty on a person not covered by items mentioned in the proviso.

3. The judgment is very clear. We have pointed out what is the meaning of Rule 7. If that meaning is not acceptable or according to the Corporation is incorrect, the remedy is elsewhere. The Review Petition is therefore dismissed.

...